

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 3 1996

From: albert copp{ <acoppe@VNET.IBM.COM>
To: A16.A16(RM8775)
Date: 5/3/96 3:34pm
Subject: Informal Comments re:Acta petition Rulemaking N 8775

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I hereby wish to give a sample situation where VON will be useful: My son is working for Schlumberger, he is in Houston now, if he wants to keep in touch with friends and family, his monthly salary would not suffice; VON is the ideal link for him; this will not take away the need for long distance calls used by parents and grand parents. Hope this true situation helps you.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Dan Gutches <dgutches@cs.bu.edu>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/3/96 5:36am
Subject: voice over Internet

MAY 3 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Dear FCC,

I think the idea of making software such as Internet Phone illegal is totally ridiculous. It would be like saying: only text can be transmitted over the Internet. Will the cable companies now come out and demand that sending video data be made illegal?

Please note that I do not have any special interests in this matter. I do not even use such software. But the idea of limiting communication on the internet bothers me. It is also very foolish to think that any law would stop people from sending voice over the internet. You could only prevent people from selling software in stores. This would not do much but kill off an industry.

+-----+
| Dan Gutches | Boston University CS Department | | dgutches@cs.bu.edu |
| http://acs2.bu.edu:8001/~dgutches/ |
+-----+

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

From: Lars Poulsen <lars@RNS.COM>
To: A16.A16(rm8775)
Date: 5/2/96 7:30pm
Subject: In re: The ACTA Petition against "Internet Phone"

MAY 3 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

My name is Lars Poulsen, I am manager of Remote Access Software Development at RNS (Rendezvous Network Systems), a division of Meret Communications.

I am also a user of the Internet, and have worked for the last 15 years in various projects related to the construction of a worldwide open network inexpensive enough to allow nearly universal access. This informal comment is filed in my capacity as an informed user of the network.

Where regulated and unregulated services overlap, there is a tendency for market anomalies, which can be viewed as business opportunities or as abusive exploitation of regulatory loopholes. Such overlaps are unavoidable in times of transition, when the rules are changing significantly.

The US telephone network has been in transition since the Modified Final Judgement introduced competition in the provision of long distance telephone services. After a decade of changes, the Congress finally caught up and rewrote the legislation governing this area, and it is clear that several revisions of the Telecommunications Act will be happening over the next couple of years, as the relative strength of the various players adjust to the new conditions, and new rules are issued to curb abuses.

Through these changes, the commission, as well as Congress should be guided by a set of goals for the process and for its outcome:

- it is in the public interest to have a ubiquitous and inexpensive network providing a great variety of services affordable to the public and to business.
- it is in the public interest to allow market mechanisms to arbitrate most of the naturally occurring conflicts of interest, rather than for the commission to have to micro-manage a forever changing offering of services.
- its is in the public interest to avoid monopolization of any of the varied services.
- it is in the public interest to support widespread experimentation with new technology, which may in the long run lead to more cost-effective ways to provide services.

The Internet has been very successful because the fundamental network is conceptually simple, yet flexible enough to allow a large variety of services to be built on the simple foundation.

One such innovative service has been the transmission of voice messages across the data network. The petitioner in this case fears that this technology - which today delivers a service as inferior to regular telephone service as does amateur radio - may soon be so succesful that it draws customers away from the traditional long-distance telephone carriers, and that in this competition, the telephone carriers face an unfair competition, because they are charged per-minute access fees to the local loop, which the Internet Service Providers do not have to pay.

The goals above would support a hands-off stance, allowing experimentation with new technologies, and fostering competition between similar services provisioned by different technologies.

Yet at the same time, the petitioner's claim that the two technologies are not competing on equal terms, also has merit.

In resolving this dilemma, I pray that the commission will resolve the conflict, not by banning new technology, nor by imposing per-minute access charges on the Internet Service Providers, but by repealing the per-minute access charges on the inter-exchange telephone carriers.

I realize that these access charges are an integral part of the funding for local access and universal access, and I suggest that the funds lost to the universal service fund and the local telephone companies be made up by an increase in the monthly subscriber line charge or the subscription rates for the local loop.

I am aware that a similar comment has been submitted by the Taxpayers'

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

Assets Project, and having reviewed that comment, I support its arguments as well as its conclusions.

Yours sincerely

/ Lars Poulsen lars@RNS.COM +1-805-562-3158

RNS / Meret Communications

7402 Hollister Avenue

Goleta, CA 93117

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

MAY 3 1996

From: FCCINFO
To: rm8775
Date: 5/2/96 5:32pm
Subject: Chairman's Column Comments -Reply

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

>>> <vlee@dev.infomkt.ibm.com> 03/05/96 04:36pm >>>
Vincent M. Lee (vlee@dev.infomkt.ibm.com) writes:

Please forgive me for writing this in the response area for you column however I recently read an article on Interactive Weekly stating that the American Carriers Telecommunication Association is petitioning the FCC to not allow further sales of hardware or software that would allow voice communication over the internet. I beg of you not to let this petition go through. I know I speak for a majority of the internet users when I say this. It would be tragic to allow progress in communication to be stopped by the greed of large corporations who only care about their fat paychecks. As far as I can see, the phone companies are frightened that perhaps one day all communication will be over the internet and not over their proprietary communications systems.

I only have the following to add. If you seriously consider their petition, you should then be forced to looking at chat and email applications as do they not provide the same functions as the telegraph and or radio.

Thank You for your time

Vincent Lee

PS: I would welcome feedback on this subject as I can then apprise many of the situation.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: hatley.dev.infomkt.ibm.com
Remote IP address: 204.146.132.102

No. of Copies rec'd _____
ACDE